

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

CHRISTOPHER S. STRECKENBACH,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 15-CV-451

CHARLES VAN DENSEN,

Defendant.

ORDER

Christopher Scott Streckenbach, a Wisconsin state prisoner, filed a *pro se* action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging his civil rights were violated. This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's motion to compel. (ECF No. 26.)

The plaintiff states that the defendant objected to nearly all of his interrogatories and he needs the information for "future briefs, jury trial, etc." (ECF No. 26.) The plaintiff attached the defendant's responses to his motion to compel. (ECF No. 26-1.)

First, Local Civil Rule 37 requires that all motions to compel be accompanied by a written certification by the movant that he unsuccessfully conferred or attempted to confer in good faith with the opposing party in an attempt to obtain the discovery without court action. (E.D. Wis.) The plaintiff's motion does not comply with this rule because

it does not include such a certification. The Court denies his motion to compel.

Second, the Court did a cursory review of the defendant's responses to the plaintiff's interrogatories, and it appears that for all but two of the interrogatories, the defendant responded to the interrogatories subject to and without waiving stated objections. (ECF No. 26-1.) Given that the defendant responded to the plaintiff's interrogatories, it is unclear to the Court what additional information the plaintiff desires.

The two interrogatories that the defendant objected to relate to an outdated policy that was not in effect at the time of the events alleged in the plaintiff's complaint. The defendant objected to these interrogatories because the information they seek is irrelevant to the plaintiff's action. The Court agrees with this objection.

With these observations in mind, the plaintiff should consider whether conferring with the defendant and/or further pursuing his motion to compel is necessary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT that the plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 26) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 9th day of November, 2015.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge